REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, and 18-20 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 8, and 14 are independent claims. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 12-16, and 18-19 have been amended, claims 4, 11, and 17 have been cancelled, and no claims have been added.

Applicants are not conceding in this Application that those canceled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the present Application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Examiner Interview

Applicants note with appreciation the telephonic interview conducted between Applicants' representative, the Examiner, and the Examiner's supervisor on October 23, 2007. During the telephonic interview, the Examiner, the Examiner's supervisor, and Applicants' representative discussed the 103 reference (Nowlin, U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0144009). In particular, Applicants' representative discussed that Applicants' invention uses an enhanced presence ping to instruct client devices to provide enhanced status information to an access point that allows an information system administrator to identify a network's actual spatial capacity requirements, such as a client's total packets received from the access point, signal strength, and system power state (dependent claim 4 limitation). In contrast, Nowlin determines a received signal strength from a client based upon the strength of the signal at the access point's antenna, but never discloses a client collecting and sending signal strength information. Nowlin also discloses how to position antennas based upon each antenna's particular broadcast radius, but never discloses a client collecting system power state information and providing the information to an access point. Applicants' representative suggested amending Applicants' independent claims to include limitations found in original

dependent claim 4, as well as further describing which actions the client performs. The Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor suggested that such amendments may position Applicants' claims to read over the art of record.

Drawings

Applicants note that the Examiner did not indicate whether the formal drawings, filed with Applicants' application, are accepted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate whether the formal drawings are accepted in the next office communication.

Specification Objections

The specification stands objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for claim 14. Applicants have amended claim 14 accordingly, and request removal of the objection to the specification in the next Office communication.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-15, 17, and 19 stand objected to because of minor informalities. Claims 4, 11, and 17 have been canceled in this response and, therefore, objections to these claims are moot.

In order to maintain proper antecedent basis and agreed upon by the Examiner's supervisor during the telephonic interview, Applicants have not amended claims 1, 5-6, 8, 12-14, and 19 as suggested by the Office Action. Applicants' request that the Examiner reconsider objections to these claims.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 14, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Netbotz (WO 02/0601624, hereinafter "Netbotz"). Claims 3-13 and 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Netbotz in view of Nowlin (U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0144009, hereinafter "Nowlin"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Claims 4, 11, and 17 have been canceled in this response and, therefore, rejections to these claims are moot.

Applicants have incorporated the limitations originally found in dependent claim 4 into independent claim 1. As amended, claim 1 is directed to a method including limitations of:

- retrieving an enhanced presence ping bit at a client;
- identifying, at the client, that the enhanced presence ping bit is enabled, wherein the enablement of the enhanced presence ping bit corresponds to an enhanced presence ping mode;
- collecting enhanced status information at the client based upon the identification, wherein the enhanced status information is selected from the group consisting of a total packet number, a signal strength, and a system power state; and
- sending the enhanced status information from the client to an access point over a wireless network.

Applicants' invention uses an enhanced presence ping to instruct client devices to provide enhanced status information to an access point that allows an information system administrator to identify a network's actual spatial capacity requirements, such as a client's total packets sent to and received from the access point, signal strength, and system power state. The Office Action states that Nowlin teaches collection of a signal strength and a system power state (see Office Action, page 7). After further review of Nowlin, Applicants respectfully disagree. Nowlin states:

> "Server 250 may determine which of antennas 210a and 210b may indicate through a variety of methods. For example, a determination of **received signal strength** at antenna 210a and 210b may indicate which antennal is closest to device 230." (para. 28, emphasis added)

> "Note that such a **radius may be based on a given power level** for the antenna, such that the antenna, with a predetermined power setting, can be expected to broadcast a useful signal only within the space limited by the radius 120." (para. 25, emphasis added)

As can be seen from the first excerpt above, Nowlin teaches measuring *received signal strength* from a client at the antenna in order to determine which antenna is closer to the client, which is not the same as the client collecting and sending signal strength information to a an access point as claimed by Applicants. The Office Action

states that Netbotz does not teach such limitations, and indeed Netbotz does not teach such limitations.

In addition, as can be seen from the second excerpt above, Nowlin discusses the positioning of antennas based upon their particular broadcast radius. Again, this is different than collecting system power state information at the client and sending the system power state information to an access point as claimed by Applicants. The Office Action states that Netbotz does not teach such limitations, and indeed Netbotz does not teach such limitations.

Therefore, based on the above discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 as amended is patentable over Netbotz in view of Nowlin. Claim 8 is an information handling system claim including similar limitations as claim 1 and, therefore claim 8 is patentable over Netbotz in view of Nowlin for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over Netbotz in view of Nowlin as discussed above. Claim 14 is a computer program product claim including similar limitations as claim 1 and, therefore, claim 14 is patentable over Netbotz in view of Nowlin for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable over Netbotz in view of Nowlin as discussed above.

Notwithstanding the fact that claim 5 is dependent upon claim 1 and, therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, claim 5 adds limitations to claim 1 of:

- receiving an enhanced presence ping control packet at the client from the access point; and
- enabling the enhanced presence ping bit at the client in response to receiving the enhanced presence ping control packet.

Applicants' enable an enhanced presence ping bit at the client in response to receiving an enhanced presence ping control packet. This informs the client to enter into enhanced presence ping mode and collect specific system information. The Office Action points to an excerpt in Nowlin to reject this limitation, but the excerpt merely discusses an access point sending a ping request and receiving a response. Nowlin states:

> "The processor is to **ping a remote device** through a wireless network, the wireless network coupled to the wireless network interface. The processor is also to **receive a response** from the remote device." (para. 23, emphasis added)

As can be seen from the above excerpt, Nowlin teaches a processor, which is included in a system that communicates with a client, to ping the client and receive a response from the client. This is different than Applicants' invention because Applicants receive an enhanced presence ping control packet *"at the client from the access point*;" and "***enable the enhanced presence ping bit at the client*** *in response to receiving the enhanced presence ping control packet.*" The Office Action states that Netbotz does not teach such limitations, and indeed Netbotz does not teach such limitations.

Therefore, based on the above discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 5 is patentable over Netbotz in view of Nowlin. Claim 12 is an information handling system claim including similar limitations as claim 5 and, therefore claim 12 is patentable over Netbotz in view of Nowlin for at least the same reasons that claim 5 is patentable over Netbotz in view of Nowlin as discussed above. Claim 18 is a computer program product claim including similar limitations as claim 5 and, therefore, is patentable over Netbotz in view of Nowlin for at least the same reasons that claim 5 is patentable over Netbotz in view of Nowlin as discussed above.

Each of the remaining claims 2-3, 6-7, 9-10, 13, 15-16, and 19-20 depend, either directly or indirectly, upon one of the allowable independent claims 1, 8, or 14. Therefore, each of claims 2-3, 6-7, 9-10, 13, 15-16, and 19-20 are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable as discussed above.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196/

Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742